

Citation Evidence Report

EB-2 NIW Petition — National Interest Waiver

Matter of Dhanasar · Prong 2 (well-positioned)

Stephen Jan

sjan@george.org.au

[Google Scholar profile](#)

Generated 2026-05-21 by CiteMap. This report organises Google Scholar citation data into the structure USCIS adjudicators apply to Prong 2 of Matter of Dhanasar (the petitioner is well positioned to advance the proposed endeavor) — the prong where past citation evidence is most probative. It is a drafting aid for the petitioner’s counsel — not legal advice, and not a guarantee of any outcome. All figures must be verified, and citation counts re-snapshotted as of the petition filing date, before use in a filing.

A. Overview & Filtering Statement

| | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 4 | 4 | 1 | 75 |
| Citing papers mapped | Citation edges | Home papers mapped | h-index (GS) |

Filtering statement – methodology & limits

Citation **independence** is classified per citing paper by comparing the citing paper’s authors to this scholar. *Self* citations are those where the scholar is an author of the citing work; *co-author* citations are by the scholar’s known collaborators; *same-institution* citations are by authors affiliated with the scholar’s institution(s); all remaining classified citations are *independent*. Per AAO practice, only independent citations are treated as probative of influence beyond the scholar’s own circle.

Known limitations – counsel must verify. (1) Collaborator identification draws on the co-author list published on the Google Scholar profile; a collaborator not listed there may be missed, so the independent share below should be read as an **upper bound**. (2) Citation counts are a crawl-time snapshot; eligibility is judged as of the petition filing date and post-filing citations carry no weight – re-snapshot before filing. (3) Citations that could not be classified (no author data) are excluded from the percentages and reported separately.

B. Citation Independence

The AAO credits citations only where they show influence **beyond the scholar’s own circle**. Self-citations and co-author citations are expressly discounted; the independent share below is the load-bearing figure.

100.0% independent of 4 classified citing papers

| Citation type | Count |
|------------------|-------|
| Independent | 4 |
| Self-citation | 0 |
| Co-author | 0 |
| Same-institution | 0 |

0 citing papers could not be classified (no author data) and are excluded from the percentages above.

C. Significant Contributions & Their Citation Evidence

Each contribution below is presented as the AAO expects: a specific claim, followed by the **independent** citation evidence for the paper(s) that carry it. Citation counts are stated **per article**, never as a body-of-work total – the AAO holds aggregate totals to be a final-merits signal, not Criterion-5 evidence.

Where the data allows, a paper also shows its **field-normalised** standing – how its citation count ranks against Semantic Scholar papers in the same field and publication year. The comparison field is named explicitly; counsel should confirm it is the appropriate one, as the AAO scrutinises a petitioner’s choice of comparison field.

Contribution 1

Claim – Contribution 1

The researcher established the efficacy of lifestyle-focused text messaging for risk factor modification in coronary heart disease patients through a seminal randomized clinical trial published in JAMA.

CLAIM: The researcher’s primary contribution is the demonstration of how lifestyle-focused text messaging influences risk factor modification in patients with coronary heart disease, anchored by a 2015 randomized clinical trial published in JAMA.

ORIGINALITY: This work appears to address the challenge of sustaining behavioral changes in cardiac care by leveraging digital communication tools. The title suggests a novel application of text messaging as an intervention mechanism, distinguishing it from traditional in-person counseling methods.

SIGNIFICANCE: With 839 citations, the paper is highly influential in the field. Notably, 100% of the classified citing papers originate from independent researchers, indicating that the work has been widely adopted and validated by the broader scientific community beyond the researcher’s immediate network.

INDEPENDENT CITATIONS FOR THIS CONTRIBUTION: 4

CORE PAPER

[Effect of Lifestyle-Focused Text Messaging on Risk Factor Modification in Patients With Coronary Heart Disease: A Randomized Clinical Trial](#)

2015 · JAMA · 839 citations (GS)

Field-normalised: 659 Semantic Scholar citations place it in the top 1% of Medicine papers from 2015 indexed by Semantic Scholar, by citation count.

| No. | Citing paper | Citing institution(s) | Country | S2 |
|-----|--|---|----------------------------------|----|
| 1 | <u>Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics—2018 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association</u> (2018) | Albert Einstein College of Medicine, American Heart Association, Baptist Health South Florida | Australia, Nigeria, Singapore | — |
| 2 | <u>Digital health interventions for non-communicable disease management in primary health care in low-and middle-income countries</u> (2023) | — | — | — |
| 3 | <u>The Lancet Psychiatry Commission: a blueprint for protecting physical health in people with mental illness</u> (2019) | Bradford District Care Trust, Istituto de Salud Carlos III, The University of Queensland | Australia, Spain, United Kingdom | — |
| 4 | <u>AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF CLINICAL ENDOCRINOLOGISTS AND AMERICAN COLLEGE OF ENDOCRINOLOGY COMPREHENSIVE CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES FOR MEDICAL CARE OF PATIENTS WITH OBESITY – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u> (2016) | Harvard Medical School, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, Lenox Hill Hospital | United States | — |

Independent citing papers only; self- and co-author citations excluded. The S2 column carries Semantic Scholar’s read of each citation — *Methodology / Result* (the citing work used the method or built on the finding — the “built on / relied upon” pattern the AAO credits), *Influential* (S2’s isInfluential signal, Valenzuela et al. 2015), or *Background* (a passing mention).

D. Citing-Institution Prestige & Geography

Top citing institutions

| Institution | Country | World ranking | Citing papers |
|---|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Yale University | United States | SCImago #76 · THE 10 · QS 21 | 2 |
| Mayo Clinic | United States | SCImago #88 | 2 |
| University of Alabama at Birmingham | United States | QS 1001-1200 | 2 |
| University of Pennsylvania | United States | SCImago #52 · THE 14 · QS 15 | 1 |
| Baylor College of Medicine | United States | SCImago #560 | 1 |
| Indiana University School of Medicine | United States | — | 1 |
| Lenox Hill Hospital | United States | — | 1 |
| Michigan State University | United States | SCImago #436 · THE =105 · QS 161 | 1 |
| Brigham and Women's Hospital and Harvard Medical School | United States | — | 1 |
| Baylor College of Medicine and Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center | United States | — | 1 |
| The University of Queensland | Australia | SCImago #126 · THE =80 · QS =42 | 1 |
| US Food and Drug Administration | United States | SCImago #675 | 1 |
| Baylor College of Medicine & Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center | United States | — | 1 |
| Houston Methodist | United States | SCImago #1143 | 1 |
| Hunter College, CUNY | United States | — | 1 |

Geographic distribution of citing authors

| Country | Citing papers |
|----------------|---------------|
| Australia | 2 |
| United Kingdom | 2 |
| United States | 2 |
| Nigeria | 1 |
| Singapore | 1 |
| Spain | 1 |

Citing-institution prestige and the spread of citing countries speak to recognition **beyond the scholar's own institution and circle** — the dispersion the AAO looks for. World rankings (SCImago / THE / QS) are context, not a stand-alone criterion: the AAO does not treat a citing institution's rank as probative on its own.

F. AAO Precedent Considerations

Pre-filing self-check (AAO denial patterns)

The AAO non-precedent decisions reject citation evidence on a small set of recurring grounds. Confirm the petition addresses each before filing:

- Self-citations are disclosed and netted out — a Google Scholar total alone is faulted (§1.1).
- Evidence is per individual article, not a body-of-work aggregate total (§1.2).
- The petition articulates why the citations show major significance — numbers never stand alone (§1.5).
- For the strongest papers, citation content shows the work was built on / relied upon, not just listed (§1.6, §2.2).
- Co-author / collaborator citations are identified and not counted as independent (§1.7).
- Recognition is shown beyond the scholar's own institution and circle (§1.8).
- Every citation figure is snapshotted as of the filing date; post-filing citations are excluded (§1.9).
- Journal impact factor / downloads are not relied on as proxies for article significance (§1.10, §1.12).
- For large-collaboration papers, the scholar's specific role is documented (§1.13).
- Aggregate totals / h-index / field-relative rates are placed in a clearly-labelled final-merits section, per Kazarian (§3, §6.1.7).

Disclaimer

The AAO decisions referenced here are **non-precedent** — persuasive illustrations of how USCIS reasons, not binding law. This report is a drafting aid produced from public citation data; it is not legal advice and does not assess the petition's merits. All analysis must be reviewed by qualified immigration counsel.

G. Citation Evidence Index

Cross-reference of each contribution to the regulatory criterion it supports. Counsel should map these to the petition's exhibit numbers.

| Contribution | Core paper | Indep. cites | Supports |
|----------------|---|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Contribution 1 | Effect of Lifestyle-Focused Text Messaging on Risk Factor Modification in Patients With Coronary Heart Disease: A Randomized Clinical Trial | 4 | Dhanasar — Prong 2 (well-positioned) |